## Remarks

Claims 1-19 are original claims. Claims 20-25 have been previously presented. Claim 26 is currently amended to include the subject matter of Claim 27, which has been cancelled.

The Examiner has objected to Claim 26 because of a typographical error. By this amendment, the error has been corrected.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 6-8, 10-12, 15, 16, 26 and 27 under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by US 6,351,467 to Dillon. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection.

Nowhere does Dillon show or suggest:

"each packetized program stream having associated therewith program identification information",

as specifically recited in Claim 6. The Examiner has pointed to Figure 2 and column 8, line 63, to column 9, line 15 of Dillon. Nowhere does this portion of Dillon show or suggest that each packetized program stream has associated therewith program identification information. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 6 is not affected by Dillon.

Claims 7 and 8 are dependent from Claim 6 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 6.

Similarly, nowhere does Dillon show or suggest:

"using a predetermined algorithm and identification information associated with the particular packetized program information",

as specifically recited in Claim 10. In column 16, Dillon lists various data which may be carried in a PID field. However, Dillon does not include information associated with a particular packetized program. It is therefore clear that Dillon does not affect the patentability of Claim 10.

Claims 11 and 12 are dependent from Claim 10 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 10.

Similarly, nowhere does Dillon show or suggest:

"determining in the first device, identification information associated with the particular packetized program stream",

as specifically set forth in Claim 15. As set forth above, Dillon does not include information associated with a particular packetized program stream. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 15 is not affected by Dillon.

Claim 16 is dependent from Claim 15 and adds further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that Claim 16 is patentable as its parent Claim 15.

Nowhere does Dillon show or suggest:

"means for disassociating from said first internet protocol multicast group; and

means for associating with a second internet protocol multicast group based on a channel change",

as specifically recited in Claim 26 as amended. The Examiner has pointed to column 18, lines 15 to 65 of Dillon. However, nowhere in this portion of Dillon is there any showing or suggestion of means for disassociating from an internet protocol multicast group, and for associating with a second internet protocol multicast group based on a channel change. It is

therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 26 as amended is not affected by Dillon.

The Examiner has pointed out that the application currently names joint inventors. The Examiner's presumption is correct that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time the claimed inventions were made.

Claims 1-3, 13, 17 and 20-25 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Dillon in view of US 6,018,764 to Field et al. Neither Dillon nor Field et al shows or suggests:

"each packetized program stream having associated therewith program identification information",

as specifically set forth in Claim 1. Dillon has been discussed above. The Examiner has pointed to column 6, lines 15 to 27 of Field et al. Field et al. lists various data that may be included in a PID. However nowhere does Field et al. teach or suggest that each packetized program stream has associated therewith program identification information. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 1 it is not affected by either Dillon or Field et al.

Claims 2 and 3 are dependent from Claim 1 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 1.

Claim 13 is dependent from Claim 12, which has been discussed above. Nowhere does Field et al show or suggest that:

"the determining step comprises determining the multicast address in response to a program ID (PID), satellite number, and transponder number associated with the particular packetized program stream",

as specifically recited in Claim 13. It is therefore clear that neither Dillon nor Field et al affect the patentability of Claim 13.

Claim 17 depends from Claim 15 and adds further advantageous features. Nowhere does Field et al show or suggest:

"determining, in the first device, identification information associated with a particular packetized program stream",

as recited in Claim 15. Although Field et al includes various data in a PID, such PID is not unique to a particular packetized program stream. Note from column 5, lines 60-61, that the same PID may be assigned to successive packets of a particular HTML page. It is therefore clear that neither Dillon nor Field et al affect the patentability of Claim 15. Since Claim 17 depends from Claim 15 and adds further advantageous features, the Applicants submit that Claim 17 is patentable as its parent Claim 15.

Nowhere does either Dillon or Field et al show or suggest:

"means for assigning a unique internet protocol multicast address to each packetized program stream",

as specifically recited in Claim 20. The Examiner has pointed to column 5, lines 11-21, column 17, lines 1-11, and column 30, lines 23 to 26, of Dillon. Column 5, lines 11 to 21, discuss channel content, but not a means for assigning a unique internet protocol multicast address to each packetized program stream. Column 17, lines 1-11, state that multicast network 24 provides a single IP multicast address. It is therefore clear that this portion of Dillon does not show or suggest a means for assigning a unique internet protocol multicast address to each packetized program stream. Column 30, lines 23-26, is a portion of claim 6 of Dillon, which recites means for assigning one or more multicast addresses to an announcement transmission. Again, it is clear that Dillon does not show

or suggest a means for assigning a unique internet protocol multicast address the each packetized program stream. As discussed above, nowhere does Field et al show or suggest this structure. It is therefore clear that even if the structures of Dillon and Field et al were to be combined, the patentability of Claim 20 would not be affected.

Claims 21 to 25 are dependent from Claim 20 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 20.

Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Dillon in view of US 5,864,358 to Suzuki et al. As the Examiner has correctly pointed out, Claim 9 is dependent from Claim 8. Claim 8 is dependent from independent Claim 6, which is discussed above with regard to Dillon. Suzuki et al. relates to a method for switching programs in digital broadcasting. Nowhere does Suzuki et al show or suggest:

"each packetized program stream having associated there with program identification information",

as specifically set forth in Claim 6. Since Claim 9 is dependent from Claim 6 and adds further advantageous features, the Applicants submit that Claim 9 is patentable as its parent Claim 6.

Claims 4, 5, 14, 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Dillon in view of Field et al and Suzuki et al. Claims 4 and 5 are dependent from Claim 1. Dillon and Field et al have been discussed above with regard to Claim 1. Nowhere does Suzuki et al show or suggest:

"each packetized program stream having associated therewith program identification information",

as specifically set forth in Claim 1. Rather, Suzuki et al identifies only a channel, and requires a program association table to identify a specific program. See column 3, lines 48-49. It is therefore clear that even if Dillon were to be combined with Field et al and Suzuki et al, the patentability of Claims 4 and 5 would not be affected.

Claim 14 is dependent from Claim 10, which has been discussed above with regard to Dillon. Neither Field et al nor Suzuki et al show or suggest:

"using a predetermined algorithm and identification information associated with the particular packetized program information",

as specifically recited in Claim 10. Rather, Field et al. lists various data that may be included in a PID. However nowhere does Field et al. teach or suggest that the particular packetized program information has associated therewith a predetermined algorithm and program identification information. Similarly, nowhere does Suzuki et al show or suggest:

"using a predetermined algorithm and identification information associated with the particular packetized program information",

as specifically recited in Claim 10. Rather, Suzuki et al identifies only a channel, and requires a program association table to identify a specific program. See column 3, lines 48-49. It is therefore clear that even if Dillon were to be combined with Field et al and Suzuki et al, the patentability of parent Claim 10 would not be affected, and similarly, the patentability of subclaim 14 would not be affected.

Claims 18 and 19 are dependent from Claim 15. Claim 15 has been previously discussed with regard to Dillon. Nowhere does either Field et al or Suzuki et al show or suggest:

"determining in the first device, identification information associated with the particular packetized program stream",

as specifically recited in Claim 15. Rather, Field et al. lists various data that may be included in a PID. However nowhere does Field et al. teach or suggest that the particular packetized program stream is associated with identification information. Furthermore, nowhere does Suzuki et al show or suggest this method. Rather, Suzuki et al identifies only a channel, and requires a program association table to identify a specific program. See column 3, lines 48-49. It is therefore clear that even if Dillon were to be combined with Field et al and Suzuki et al, the patentability of Claim 15 would not be affected. Since Claims 18 and 19 are dependent from Claim 15, and add further advantageous features, the Applicants submit that Claims 18 and 19 are patentable as their parent Claim 15.

The Applicants have reviewed the cited references to Kloper, Powell et al., Monta et al, Lausier, Birdwell et al. and Pecus et al, which the Examiner has not relied upon. The Applicants believe that these references are no more pertinent to the claimed invention than the references upon which the Examiner has relied.

The Applicants are unable to locate U.S. Pat. No. 76,744,789, which has been cited by the Examiner but not relied upon. Perhaps the Examiner meant to cite US 6,744,789, which is included in the PTO-892 which accompanied the Office communication.

The Applicants have also reviewed US 6,744,789 to Michener, and believe that this reference is no more pertinent to the claimed invention than the references upon which the Examiner has relied.

The Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

No fee is believed to have been incurred by virtue of this amendment, in addition to the fee for the extension of the period for response. However if a fee is incurred on the basis of this amendment, please charge such fee against the Applicants Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
John Alan Gervais
Terry Wayne Lockridge

/Daniel E. Sragow/

by Daniel E. Sragow
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 22,856
609/734-6832

THOMSON Licensing Inc.
Patent Operation
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: 26 June 2009